

# New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News-Editorials  
—Advertisements—  
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1918

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc.,  
a New York Corporation, Office: 120 Broadway, New York,  
N. Y. Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Lee, Secretary;  
N. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 134  
Nassau Street, New York, Telephone: BR 5-0000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, including Postage:  
In the United States: Outside of Greater  
New York  
First and Second Years—Within 100 Miles of  
New York City  
Daily and Sunday ..... \$10.00 \$20.00  
Daily only ..... 5.00 10.00  
Sunday only ..... 5.00 10.00

THIRD TO EIGHTH ZONE, INCLUSIVE—More than  
New York  
Daily and Sunday ..... \$11.00 \$22.00  
Daily only ..... 5.50 11.00  
Sunday only ..... 5.50 11.00

FOREIGN RATES  
Daily and Sunday ..... \$12.00 \$24.00  
Daily only ..... 6.00 12.00  
Sunday only ..... 6.00 12.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class  
Mail Matter

GUARANTEE  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE  
TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction  
results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your  
money back on demand. No red tape. No fussing.  
We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS  
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use  
for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or  
not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local  
news of all communities within published here.  
All rights of republication of all other matter herein  
are also reserved.

## On into Germany—Slogan of the American troops in France.

### Guilt as Such

A while ago secret diplomacy was the go-at-object in all discussions touching the origin of war. It was righteously denounced on every occasion, especially by pacifists, intellectuals and liberals. We had the picture of diplomats around a table higgling and bargaining and threatening in cold, inhuman terms, and betraying people again and again into wars they knew nothing about—until it was too late. The Russian Bolsheviks were treated as heroes for publishing all the secret treaties they could find in the state pigeonholes at Petrograd. They went directly themselves and made a secret treaty with Germany, but that, perhaps, was only to prove that mankind was frailer than its ideals. At all events, secret diplomacy was to be made an end of because it was cold, hard and mercenary, lacking any moral sense or attributes whatever.

But the curious fact is that those very persons who so convincingly damned the old diplomacy are now talking of a peace by the diplomatic method, calling it one time a peace by understanding, again a peace of acquiescence, then a peace liberal, or a peace democratic—meaning always a practical peace to be evolved in remote and secret conferences, as always before. They see no inconsistency in this; but at least they feel one, for they have at the same time stopped denouncing the ancient technique of diplomacy.

Obviously, a practical peace could be achieved only through diplomacy; and diplomacy to arrange such a peace would require the hated table, the sequestered chamber, the subtle language, the unemotional detachment and all the accessories which were to have been abolished. Therefore, what is now solemnly proposed by the pacifists, liberals, et al., is nothing less than that the war shall be ended by the same sinister priestcraft which they charged with having brought the deluge to pass.

Diplomacy in this light is the name of an evil god. Men tremble upon it in rage as the source of misfortunes which they have brought upon themselves. Then, unable to escape from those misfortunes, they become superstitious and would reverently gather together the pieces and restore the outraged image.

But it is not so. Diplomacy is a function of government. It expresses the relation of one government to another, and it is cold, calculating, selfish, heartless, higgling and practical for the simple reason that people have never delegated to their governments the power to make moral decisions. Therefore, the relations between governments are purely material or, as we say, un-moral.

An individual may say: "That piece of property claimed by my neighbor really belongs to me. It has been in my family for ten generations. He is wrong as to where the old fence was. However, rather than prove the title in mortal combat I will let him take it. I shall sleep when he cannot."

That is a moral decision within the power of every individual to make touching a private concern.

It is a decision no government could make—not hitherto—for the reason stated, namely, that people have never delegated that power to any government. Therefore, diplomacy is limited to considerations of a practical and material character only.

It follows that the relations between governments are on a lower plane than those between persons. National morality is inferior to private morality. Nations are not held to account for criminal, unlawful and outrageous acts as individuals are. In private relationships guilt is personal and shall be atoned for. In the case of nations it is impersonal and historical only.

If the guilt of Germany could be personified in one human figure, imagine with what utter horror it would be regarded by all normal people, and how impossible it would be to think of admitting it to human society! Yet it is proposed that the war shall be ended by a peace of acquiescence, and that Germany shall be readmitted to the family of nations.

No instance is known of one nation first passing and then enforcing a moral judgment upon another. If once it were done all history would date from that

epoch, and the world would be a different place forever.

The opportunity is present. The Allied nations may pass moral judgment upon Germany and arrange beforehand the guarantee of its fulfillment. That is the highest argument of all for the "bitter end."

The criminal nation must first surrender unconditionally.

What follows should be not a peace conference but a trial. Let us bring the criminal nation before the bar of civilized opinion, to be judged and sentenced on the evidence.

If Germany should say, "We cannot bear it," let the answer be, "Neither could they."

If Germany should say, "But we shall perish," let the answer be, "And so have they."

And after this, whether Germany shall die or not, no nation will dare again ever to break faith with humanity and set the law of its own expediency above the moral sense of the whole world.

### The Senate's Plain Duty

The women who have been pleading so long for suffrage are confident that success will crown their efforts when the Federal amendment comes to a vote in the Senate on Thursday. There is every reason to understand their confidence. It is inconceivable that the senior legislative body of the United States will in this critical hour deliberately turn its back on the example and democratic progress of the entire English-speaking world and face toward an obsolete and outworn tradition.

The more interesting point we take to be the question of party line-up which will result. As a Republican newspaper, The Tribune is deeply concerned that Republican Senators shall lead, and not follow, in this liberal and patriotic reform. The traditions of Republicanism all strongly favor woman suffrage, and woman suffrage by this particular measure of Federal amendment. There is, conversely, strong precedent for Democratic opposition. Thus far the Republicans of House and Senate have maintained this natural leadership. We very greatly hope that when the roll is called on Thursday next there will be an overwhelming answer from the party of Lincoln making plain its staunch adherence to its noblest traditions.

Very great credit is due to President Wilson for his outspoken pleas for the Federal amendment. He has stated with eloquence and exactness the prime reason why amid the great forces of democracy now stirring in the world the stand of the United States in this signal test of faith in our principles of government possesses such far-reaching importance.

There is, in addition, the point which The Tribune has urged supporting the immediate passage of the amendment. If passed by the Senate at once it can become law within a very few years, in time to admit women to be heard directly and with full voice in the making of peace and in the adjustments that must follow thereafter. Through these women, and through them alone, can be voiced the will of a large part of the manhood of the United States, that manhood which is pouring forth its life-blood on the fields of France. The tie between home and trench is close. Wives and mothers and sisters understand better than any one else the views and decisions of our men who are in the furnace of war.

Canada recognized this fact when she enfranchised the women relatives of soldiers. There is no way in which this partial enfranchisement can be accomplished in this country. Nor is it desirable. The broad need of all women's hearts and minds in the judgments of the nation must prevail.

We can be glad and thankful that in doing this act of wide wisdom and justice we can perpetuate in some measure the wishes and hopes of those who have made the last sacrifice for their country.

### Dodging the Inevitable

The House of Representatives has once more refused to create a committee on war expenditures. The House usually shrinks from modernizing its procedure and conforming its methods of doing business to new requirements. A committee on expenditures would be a radical innovation. Therefore the majority in the present House will have none of it.

This fear is unreasonable. It obstructs a recasting of the relations of the legislative branch to appropriations and expenditures which our war experience has made inevitable. We could blunder along without a budget system and without a rational apportionment of responsibility for our national outlay while we were spending only \$1,000,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 a year. But it is preposterous to go ahead spending \$20,000,000,000 or \$25,000,000,000 a year without the safeguards of administrative accountability and legislative audit and control.

We have been proceeding on the mistaken theory that Congress is competent to originate and determine down to the last detail the expenditures of the executive branch and that it is a normal function of the executive to audit its own expense accounts. Chaos naturally results from such a confusion of duties. It is only a form of words to say that the House and Senate Appropriation committees any longer decide what the executive departments are to spend.

More than ever before the legislative committees merely register the decisions of executive officials. It could not be otherwise. Secretary McAdoo has even intervened to control the details of taxation and of other revenue legislation. And he has a logical right to do so. Under any well considered fiscal scheme the executive ought to accept full responsibility for the outlay necessary to carry out its plans. Congress really takes over a routine administrative function when it decides of its own motion what ought

to be spent by each department, bureau, commission, and so on down to the pettiest agency of government.

Under an intelligent budget system Congress would merely vote appropriations in the mass. That would end forever the dangerous fiction which permits the Administration to wash its hands of all accountability for the sum total of appropriations. But having fixed that responsibility where it belongs, Congress would be entitled to assume the broadest possible powers of audit. Having voted the money it would see to it that that money was wisely and profitably spent.

Congress cannot function efficiently until it creates a real committee on expenditures, supplanting the various make-believe committees on expenditures in the various departments carried for window-dressing purposes in its present organization.

The House and the Senate should actually "hold the purse" through a strict auditing of accounts. Congress is the natural forum in which to discuss and settle all questions as to the wisdom and usefulness of national outlay.

Think of the enormous gain in economy and in public morale which would result if Congressmen were limited to the rôle of critics of expenditure, and were effectually barred from acting as promoters of public building, river and harbor and other "pork-barrel" extravagances for the benefit of local interests.

This Congress is too deep in the ruts of the past to feel the need of new methods and a new outlook. If the Republicans carry the next House they can do nothing more timely and constructive than to create that vital auditing committee at which the torpor and timidity of the present Congress balk.

### The Austrian Legend

Germany may have been guilty of many errors in her dealings with other nations, but she has a certain long cunning which often serves her in good stead. An illustration of this is her use of Austria as the medium of her latest peace offensive. She is perfectly aware of the existence of the Austrian legend. It has had great currency in Great Britain and even greater currency in the United States. It was cultivated for a long time by the President, who hesitated even to ask for a declaration of war against Austria, though her full complicity with Germany was perfectly manifest.

This legend assumes that Austria is, in the words of a once popular melodrama, "more to be pitied than blamed." She is a proof of the truth of the copy-book adage that "evil communications corrupt good manners." But for German villany she would not be in her present humiliating position. Thus she is really a victim of the war whose woes deserve sympathetic consideration.

There never was a legend with less basis of fact. There is no nation in history whose course is more plainly marked by brutal tyranny. There is indeed a charm in the Austrian which the German does not possess. But the moral guilt of the man who stabs you with honeyed words and the man who knocks you down with a curse is the same.

It is not strange that our Italian allies should be impatient, not to say resentful, when this Austrian cult is preached by people who ought to know better. Lombardy and Venetia knew what Austrian rule was when the armies of Francis Joseph crushed out their liberties, when King Bomba, a tool of Austria, made life in the two Sicilies a hell on earth.

Nor are they without later evidence that the Austrian nature is unchanged. "The Austrians are not Germans," said a recent writer; "they have fought a comparatively clean war." Have they? They now occupy Udine, Belluno and the rest of Italy beyond the Piave. They have destroyed churches, devastated crops, hanged civilians by the wholesale and ravished women. In what does their moral superiority to the Germans consist?

William Tell has become a hero as mythical as King Arthur, Roland, Dorn and Sir Bevis, in spite of the circumstantial stories told by Tschudi and Müller. But the tyrant Gessler is still a fit symbol of Austrian rule over subject peoples. The Czech-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs will tell us that. The atrocities committed by the Austrian general Haynau in the Hungarian rebellion were such that when he visited London he was seized and beaten by the draymen of Barclay's brewery as the man who had whipped women. The court was furious, but that stout Englishman Lord Palmerston, who was Foreign Minister at the time, winked the other eye and refused to give Vienna any satisfaction.

Neither English nor American traditions, indeed, justify the growth of the Austrian legend. But still it has grown to the discomfiture of our Italian allies; and Germany obviously thinks it has some life in it yet.

### The Service Flag at City College

GOOD folk, look up to yonder hill  
Above the town so fair,  
And see a very gallant sight  
Among the towers there:  
Youth's banner on the city's crest  
In merry blue and scarlet drest.

And when the colors take the light  
And flash and float so free  
Along the royal walls of merriment,  
Who lift their eyes may see  
No more a bit of blue and red  
Above the city streets—instead

A vision: joy of April clouds  
Flung to the light of day,  
Wild dancing on the silvery steeps  
Of shepherd folk at play;  
Fields glowing like the ruby's gem  
And heroes charging over them!

ANNE W. YOUNG.

## Valorous Greeks

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I read with great interest a telegram from Athens, published in your valuable paper of the 16th inst., relative to the words uttered by Mr. Louis C. Cramp-ton, member of Congress from Michigan and now in Salonica, praising the Allied troops on the Macedonian front, and particularly the Greeks. On this occasion, although we Greeks do not like to blow our own trumpets, still we consider it necessary to enlighten the American public opinion on the noble qualities and valor of the Greek army now operating at the Macedonian front and consisting of Greeks from Greece Independent and from enslaved Greeks from Thrace, Asia Minor and Eastern Macedonia.

General Guillaumat, late commander in chief of the Allied armies in the Orient and now Governor of Paris, in his speech delivered at the Hotel de Ville, in Paris, commemorating Greece's entrance in the war, said:

"Sera de Logan is a mountain 1,300 metres (about 4,265 feet) high, 500 metres higher than the neighboring summits. It was fortified by the Germans by means of several lines of barbed wire, a great many trenches, strongly cemented shelters, etc., according to the most perfect present military ways."

"The offensive has been executed by the Archipelago Division, with the help of two more regiments belonging, respectively, to two other divisions (Crete and Serres). The objective point was this mountain and the occupation of some of the adjoining positions. This operation met with an unexpected success."

"I was personally present at the attack of the Greek soldiers. They have advanced with the same valor that characterizes our own men, and with more agility and nimbleness, which are inherent to those races of temperate mountaineers."

"I have been very much satisfied with their order and discipline. The men followed cleverly the fire of the batteries that covered them, stopping and starting their march forward whenever necessary. I was looking on them with the same emotion that reigned in my heart for our men at the Mori Home and the Height 104."

"They have voluntarily submitted themselves to any training and any effort that constitute the preparation of these enterprises. They have shown their ancestral valor, order, discipline, method and bravery—the only requisites for a final victory."

"But they have greatly paid for that success with their blood, without any loss in their morale. I have visited the wounded, and have met with the same gratifying sentiment that they have done their duty and obtained similar answers to those given in our hospitals."

"I can also assure you that we can fully rely with confidence on the Hellenic army. It is a great, ever increasing support for the Allies in the Orient."

"There is no doubt that the front in the West is much more important and draws for the time being all our attention. But we must not neglect the importance of the Oriental front. It is now in the background, but can later on in the future, with the support of the Hellenic army, play an important or even a decisive rôle in the victorious end of this world-wide struggle."

"We must confidently expect that the Hellenic army will play a rôle worthy of its valor and its ancient glory."

The Greek army has the honor to fight side by side with the armies of our gallant allies at the Balkan front for a common cause, for the prevalence of the democratic principles and for our national restoration; but up to the present they have not had the honor to have near them the gallant sons of the great American Republic, so as to become brothers on the battlefield."

We wish to have the brave American soldiers there to inspire us with the ideas of a New World, and the Greek soldiers will inspire them with the ideas of a Greek civilization. Both countries are based upon and governed by democracy; both countries have virtually the same ideals."

I therefore most respectfully appeal to President Wilson to take under a benevolent consideration the desire of the Greek army and send the gallant and illustrious sons of America over there."

N. G. KYRIKAIDES,  
President of the Central Committee of Unredeemed Greeks at Athens and Special Delegate to the United States.  
New York, Sept. 16, 1918.

## Creeling Again

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Moving picture "audiences" are long suffering. "And then, when dreary suns have set" we accept without a murmur, although we know that what the caption writer means is merely "After several days." We agree to take the hero as a lifelong cowboy, when we see that he has the hands of a debutante. We try to believe that the alleged South African jungle is not the Long Island hothouse that it appears to be. But these are the precedents of professional camera men frankly fictional. What excuse is there when Mr. George Creel's Committee on Public Information tries the same sort of thing?

A set of Mr. Creel's "War Films" was shown in this town last night, passed by a too-trusting Pennsylvania board of censors. The initial caption informed spectators that what followed showed how "the Huns, retreating before our men, leave a trail of desolation behind them," the words were to that plain effect, and the clear intent was to convey the meaning of "American troops" by the phrase "our men."

Now, our men started their advance in summer, but the pictures that Mr. Creel's committee supplies to illustrate this advance show snow on the ground. Moreover, the "our men" depicted wear Canadian uniforms. Finally, the American advance, as such, has been in Lorraine. What Mr. Creel shows is a series of pictures of Arras and Noyon, indicating the terrible conditions there obtaining when I visited those places just about a year ago.

REGINALD WRIGHT KAUFFMAN,  
Columbia, Penn., Sept. 17, 1918.

### To a Movie Hero

(From The Eagle Pass, Tex., Guide)  
Speaking of shows, I would readily pay \$2 to William S. Hart, on his way to the front trenches in France. We don't see how Uncle Sam can let a man with his talents of playing men remain on this side and help make desperadoes of the young folks when he could be doing a valuable service "over there."

## Coiled in The Capital

## Bris-s-s-bane

### What Hears-s-s-t's Editor Did With the Washington Newspaper German-American Brewers Bought for Him

By Kenneth Macgowan

Third Article

"The Law Compels the Editor to Tell Who Owns the Newspaper."

"It Ought Also Compel the Editor to Tell Who Owns the Owner."

—Brisbane's Washington Times, Feb. 23, 1918.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 22.—Who owns Arthur Brisbane? With the matter before the Senate, neither William Randolph Hearst nor the dozen German-American brewers who bought him "The Washington Times" seem battling for that honor.

Here in a third instalment of certain things written by Brisbane for "The Washington Times" and largely reprinted in Hearst's "New York American" and "The Evening Journal," is evidence that there is yet another that could look upon Brisbane and his work with all the satisfaction of a proprietor.

Previous articles have dealt with the weakening of American morale which might result from such attacks on our allies as Brisbane launched at England and Japan, and such weakening of our aid to France as would have resulted from the acceptance of his plea to go slow in "handing out money" while the threats of Japan and Mexico hung over us.

### Three Blows at America's Morale

These blows at American morale were reinforced by—

1. A constant picturing of the war as "international murder."

2. A proposal to stop the shipment of food to our allies on the plea that America's children were starving, and

3. An attempt to arouse distrust of England and dissatisfaction with Food Controller Hoover over the alleged lower scale of food costs abroad.

Here are some samples of the Brisbane phrases which replaced Hearst's favorite and reiterated shibboleth of terrorism, "this terrible war":

June 27, 1917—"... this is a sad world with its retail murders in cellars and its wholesale murders 'on the field of honor.'"

July 8—"The European nations are bankrupt; engaged in the murder game, they do not know how to stop."

"We have our troubles here in the United States, but ours are small."

"Deliver us from evil has a meaning when you see the evil that kingship, commercial envy, race and religious hatred have forced upon the world."

July 28—"Don't you wish you had such an uncle? Uncle Sam figures that he must lend five hundred million dollars a month to his allies. . . . And our financiers told us that we couldn't possibly have government ownership of railroads BECAUSE THE COUNTRY COULDN'T AFFORD IT. Evidently we can afford more for international murder than for national organization."

August 1—"Nothing has happened" since you read 'The Times' last night, except that enough money has been spent on war to build the Panama Canal, and some thousands of men have been killed and wounded."

"How long will the frightful game of murder last?"

August 16—"The Pope's question which civilization—what remains of it—must answer and which the United States CAN answer is this:

"Is this civilized world to be nothing more than a field of death? And Europe, so glorious and flourishing, is it going as if stricken by a universal madness to run to the abyss and to lend its hand to its own suicide?"

August 20—"... the game of murder."

September 2—"Is the whole world pi-block-to?" asked the old Esquimaux gentleman of Etah, wondering why the white men kill each other in war. Pi-block-to means crazy in Esquimaux talk.

"Yes, they are, just as thoroughly pi-block-to as anybody we have ever seen."

"They are crazy, wild, insane, 'meshuggah,' as our friend Nathan Straus would put it. And if they keep on they will also be 'mehullah,' which is considerably worse than pi-block-to."

"Open season' for a good many things. 'The Baltimore Sun' tells its readers that they can celebrate Labor Day to-morrow by 'tonging' for oysters or shooting squirrels in trees. In this part of the country you can go after oysters or reed birds as you prefer. But the real sport is in Europe, where it is 'open season' for men, women and children all the year round."

September 15—"This internal period of torture . . ."

September 18—"The whole world is engaged in murder."

November 29—"The whole energy of the world has been turned toward murder on land and sea, in the air and under the water."

March 5—"All civilization is engaged in murder, with barbarism looking on."

### A New Way of Winning the War

The resemblances between the thoughts of Hearst's man Brisbane and Brisbane's master Hearst are not so surprising as they are painstaking. Brisbane ended his remarks of November 29 on murder with the reflection: "We are in the war and we shall do our part TO WIN the war." Hearst

ventured to think, even as far back as April 4, 1917: "Let every energy be bent upon preparation for a powerful and wholly victorious war."

But there are times when twin thoughts cannot find the same appropriate action. For instance, Hearst in New York was able to prepare for a powerful and wholly victorious war by campaigning to keep our men, our money and our food at home. But Brisbane—some months later and in the capital of the nation—gave evidence that something was cramping his style.

It was too late to stop loans to the Allies, though there was still time to talk of their size.

It was too late to stop our soldiers, though there was still time to talk of "international murder" committed by and on millions of them.

But it was not too late to take a hand in the food business.

Brisbane's suggestion for winning the war, like Hearst's, was "Feed America first." Or—"don't feed the Allies."

### Hitting Hoover

Brisbane began the campaign in July, 1917. He drove it hardest in September and he brought it to its logical conclusion—an embargo—in December. Throughout he used tactics whose effect was not only to sow distrust of an ally, but also to undermine public confidence in Hoover—the man who was making it possible to feed the Allies and America together, and thus to take the first step toward winning the war.

July 30, 1917—"Prices UP in America—DOWN in England. A Little Puzzling, As We Are Feeding England."

September 8—"How do the English do it, once more we ask. Wheat cheaper in England than in America, flour cheaper in England than in America, and we are sending them the wheat and the flour, and lending them the money to buy it."

September 9—"Senator Reed says of Hoover: 'I am willing to hazard whatever reputation I have for judgment that this food administration will be run by this gentleman (Hoover) who lived in England all his life, whose house and whose home are in England, whose business associates are Englishmen, IN THE INTERESTS OF ENGLAND.' What of it? We went into the war largely in the interest of England and only when it became apparent that in the submarine Germany had a weapon that by starving England might beat the Allies. A little more anxiety about low prices for ordinary American citizens would be welcome, but we are in this war and we have got to help England out."

September 25—"We understand that Mr. Hoover lived in England for twenty-five years. There might still be something there for him to learn about cheap food."

September 28—"We are promised—only promised—fourteen ounces of bread for eight cents. England gets NOW sixteen ounces of bread for four and a half cents."

Perhaps the key to all this lies in the editorial columns of Brisbane's old home paper, "The Evening Journal," which said on January 10, 1918:

"... when the American people find that the European people have cheaper food and undergo less food restrictions than the American people, there is bound to arise a popular resentment and discontent WHICH WILL HAVE A BAD EFFECT UPON THE NATION'S ENTHUSIASM AND WARLIKE ENERGY."

And then—the children of America, the suffering children of America, robbed by the grasping hands of English, French and Belgian enfants terribles!

October 30—"We want to help England all we can—but not at the expense of OUR CHILDREN."

"We want to send everything possible to France, Italy and Russia, but not at the expense of OUR CHILDREN."

"You read with horror and pity that in Europe, and in Germany especially, what is called 'starvation typhus' is prevalent among children because they have been deprived of the foods they need."

"This nation wants and will tolerate no such attack on the children of America."

"Sacrifice yourself and deny yourself that you may send all to our allies abroad."

"But THE CHILDREN AT HOME FIRST AND ALWAYS. No saving at their expense."

### Behind "the Least of These"

Finally—  
December 15—"In New York alone, more than 300,000 children are underfed and may be permanently rendered inferior by this underfeeding."

"Until the children of the United States have ENOUGH no food should go out of the United States." It isn't necessary to ask where Brisbane found those figures or how they compared with those of normal peace times or with those of England, France and Belgium at that date.

It is enough to note that on this same day—and on eight consecutive days—Brisbane was devoting the space in "The Washington Times"—frequently half-page editorials—to an attempt to save from annihilation by Congress that industry which puts thousands of tons of fruits, sugars, grains and vegetables each year into a form of nourishment unsafe for childhood.

But this, you see, was the industry that owned Mr. Brisbane